

## Remarks

Claims 1-10, 12-15, and 21-28 are pending in the present application. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Furthermore, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration and allowance are requested in view of the above amendments and the remarks below.

Claims 1-10, 12-15, and 21-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Roberge et al (U.S. 6,381,611), hereafter “Roberge.”

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Roberge is defective because Roberge fails to disclose each and every feature set forth in the claims as required by 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Independent claim 1 recites:

“A method for providing a compact interface for display of an object hierarchy having a plurality of levels, comprising:

displaying a first level root node of the object hierarchy and navigation indicia indicating that the first level root node includes at least one second level child node in a first window;

upon selection of the first level root node in the first window, displaying a pop-up window that includes a listing of all second level child nodes of the first level root node immediately adjacent and to a right side of the first level root node in the first window, wherein the pop-up window is not positioned directly below the first level root node; and

selecting one of the second level child nodes from the listing of all second level child nodes included in the pop-up window;

wherein, upon selection of one of the second level child nodes, the pop-up window that includes the listing of all second level child nodes of the first level root node disappears from the first

window, and is replaced by the selected second level child node, which is displayed immediately adjacent and to the right side of the first level root node in the first window, wherein the first level root node, the navigation indicia, and the selected second level child node are displayed in a linear horizontal arrangement in the first window, and wherein a depth of a navigation path through the object hierarchy increases from left to right in the first window.”

Regarding independent claim 1, Roberge fails to disclose, *inter alia*, the features of “upon selection of the first level root node, displaying a **pop-up window** that includes a listing of all second level child nodes of the first level root node immediately **adjacent and to a right side** of the first level root node in the first window, **wherein the pop-up window is not positioned directly below the first level root node**,” “selecting one of the second level child nodes from the listing of all second level child nodes included in the pop-up window,” and “wherein, upon selection of one of the second level child nodes, the pop-up window that includes the listing of all second level child nodes of the first level root node disappears from the first window, and is replaced by the selected second level child node, which is displayed immediately adjacent and to the right side of the first level root node in the first window, **wherein the first level root node, the navigation indicia, and the selected second level child node are displayed in a linear horizontal arrangement in the first window**, and wherein a depth of a navigation path through the object hierarchy increases from left to right in the first window.”

On the contrary, Roberge clearly discloses that the windows containing first and second level child nodes (e.g., buttons 82, 93) are displayed **below** a

previous level node. See, for example, FIGS. 8 and 9 and col. 6, lines 25-30 (“buttons are displayed below the root node button ...”). To this extent, unlike the present invention (see, e.g., FIG. 10), Roberge’s system generates windows that take up a tremendous amount of real estate on a display (see, e.g., Roberge, FIG. 9).

Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is allowable. Further, Applicants submit that independent claims 9 and 21 are allowable for reasons similar to those set forth with regard to independent claim 1.

With respect to the dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable based on the above arguments, as well as for their own additional features.

If the Examiner believes that anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants’ undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/ John A. Merecki /

Dated: April 7, 2008

John A. Merecki  
Reg. No. 35,812

Hoffman, Warnick & D’Alessandro LLC  
75 State Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Albany, NY 12207  
(518) 449-0044 - Telephone  
(518) 449-0047 - Facsimile